

Message Text

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 01 BRUSSE 01710 281809 Z

44

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 NEA-10 ADP-00 SS-14 NSC-10 EPA-04 HUD-02 SCI-06

CEQ-02 INT-08 IO-12 OIC-04 OST-04 HEW-08 DODE-00 EB-11

AID-20 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-09 L-03 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01

PRS-01 GAC-01 USIA-12 MBFR-03 SAJ-01 COME-00 CG-00

RSR-01 /185 W

----- 045029

R 281622 Z MAR 73

FM AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 7057

WHITE HOUSE

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

INFO AMEMBASSY ANKARA

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY LISBON

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY LUXEMBOURG

AMEMBASSY OSLO

AMEMBASSY OTTAWA

AMEMBASSY PARIS

AMEMBASSY REYKJAVIK

AMEMBASSY ROME

AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

USMISSION NATO

LIMITED OFFICIAL USEBRUSSELS 1710

WHITE HOUSE FOR HODSOLL

E. O. 11652 NA

TAGS: SEV, NATO

SUB: CCMS: OTTAWA PLENARY APRIL 10-11, 1973

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 BRUSSE 01710 281809 Z

REF STATE 49792

1. RENSON OF THE SCIENTIFIC POLICY DIVISION IN THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE GAVE US FOLLOWING RUN-DOWN OF BELGIAN PLANS FOR THE OTTAWA PLENARY AND RELATED INFORMATION.

2. DELEGATION: SENIOR BELGIAN DELEGATE WILL BE AMBASSADOR JEAN-CHARLES SALMO, ADVISER ON ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS IN THE FOREIGN MINISTRY. ONLY OTHER DELEGATION MEMBER NAMED TO DATE IS RENSON. POSSIBILITY REMAINS THAT EXPERT FROM MINISTRY OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT AND A ROAD SAFETY EXPERT WILL ALSO ATTEND.

3. ROUND TABLE: BELGIANS ARE CONSIDERING A DISCUSSION ON A BILATERAL ARRANGEMENTS ON INLAND WATER POLLUTION BUT HAVE NOT YET MADE FINAL DECISION.

4. NEW PROJECTS: BELGIANS ARE INFORMED THAT THE GERMANS HAVE CANCELLED THEIR PLANNED A LIST OF 7 SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS. THIS WOULD NOT MAKE IT NECESSARY TO PUT HUNGARY IN EITHER CATEGORY. CONCEPTUALLY, THIS LAST VARIANT WAS THE ONLY ONE WHICH HAD THIS QUALITY, SINCE IN THE OTHER TWO VARIANTS AND IN ALL OTHER POSSIBILITIES THE ALLIES COULD ENVISAGE HUNGARY WOULD HAVE TO BE MENTIONED IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER.

13. KHLESTOV THEN ASKED IF HE WAS CORRECT IN HIS UNDERSTANDING THAT, ON MARCH 14, THE ALLIED REPS HAD ENVISAGED A PROCEDURES PAPER WHICH WOULD INCLUDE AN AGREED JOINT DECLARATION IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH ON THE FUTURE STATUS OF HUNGARY. IF SO WHAT WOULD BE THE NATURE AND CONTENT OF THIS STATEMENT, AS CONTRASTED WITH TO COMPLIMENTARY UNILATERAL STATEMENTS, AND WHAT WOULD BE THE CONTENT OF THESE STATEMENTS? THE NETHERLANDS REP EXPLAINED THAT KHLESTOV WAS CORRECT IN RECALLING THAT EARLIER, THE ALLIED REPS HAD ENVISAGED AN AGREED STATEMENT IN THE PROCEDURES PAPER, AND THAT THE IDEA OF STATEMENTS MADE BY THE TWO SIDES WAS A NEWER ONE, IN RESPONSE TO WHAT THE ALLIED REPS PERCEIVED TO BE AN EASTERN PREFERENCE. IN PUTTING FORTH THIS IDEA THE ALLIES HAD SOUGHT TO PUT FORTH ANOTHER POSSIBILITY WHICH MIGHT MAKE A SOLUTION EASIER. US REP SAID THE CONCEPTS THAT WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE TWO STATEMENTS WOULD BE THE SAME AS THOSE THAT WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE AGREED SINGLE STATEMENT AND SHOULD BE WRITTEN IN AS PART OF THE PROCEDURES PAPER. AS FOR THE CONTENT OF THE TWO STATEMENTS, HE HAD JUST SPELLED THESE OUT IN THE FORM OF 4 CONCEPTS.

14. KHLESTOV THEN ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE CONCEPTS TO BE EMBODIED IN AGREED STATEMENTS, ALSO ASKING AGAIN WHETHER A JOINT STATEMENT WOULD HAVE THE SAME IN CONTENT AS TWO SEPARATE STATEMENTS. THE U. S. REP WENT OVER THE CONCEPTS AGAIN, AND CONFIRMED THAT THE CONTENT OF THE STATEMENTS WOULD BE THE SAME. TIMMERBAYEV SAID THAT

THE LAST TWO CONCEPTS PUT FORTH BY THE U. S. REP APPEARED TO BE THE SAME. THE U. S. REP EXPLAINED THAT ONE OF THESE POINTS STATED THAT THE INCLUSION OF HUNGARY IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS HAD NOT YET BEEN DETERMINED, WHILE THE OTHER STATED THAT THIS ISSUE WOULD IN FACT BE EXAMINED AND DECIDED IN THE FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS. THERE WAS A CLEAR DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO.
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02505 03 OF 05 282027 Z

15. THE EASTERN REPS CONTINUED TO ASK ABOUT STATEMENTS, ASKING IF A SINGLE AGREED STATEMENT WOULD INCLUDE AGREEMENT BY HUNGARY, OR WOULD REPRESENT AGREEMENT ONLY BY THE 11. US REP EXPLAINED IT COULD INCLUDE CONCEPT OF HUNGARIAN AGREEMENT. KHLESTOV ASKED AGAIN IF SUCH A STATEMENT COULD BE SEPARATE FROM A PROCEDURES PAPER. HE INDICATED THAT HE THOUGHT THE WORD "COMPLEMENTARY" USED BY THE ALLIES MEANT THAT THE STATEMENTS TO BE MADE WOULD BE COMPLEMENTARY TO AND THUS OUTSIDE THE PROCEDURES PAPER. THE ALLIED REPS SAID NO, IT SHOULD BE PART OF THE PROCEDURES PAPER. KHLESTOV, ASKED WHY, IN THIS CASE, THE ALLIED REPS WERE TERMING SUCH A STATEMENT A SEPARATE DECLARATION, SINCE IT WOULD BE AN INTEGRAL PART OF A PROCEDURES DOCUMENT. THE ALLIED REPS SAID THAT THERE WAS NO PARTICULAR SIGNIFICANCE TO SUCH A DESIGNATION, AND THAT IT COULD BE VIEWED AS A SUB- PARAGRAPH OF THE PROCEDURES PAPER. IF THERE WERE TWO STATEMENTS BY THE TWO SIDES, THESE WOULD OF COURSE BE A DIFFERENT FORM BUT SHOULD BE IN THE SAME PLACE AS A SINGLE STATEMENT, I. E., AS PART OF THE FIRST PARAGRAPH. KHLESTOV SAID THAT NOW IT WAS AT LEAST CLEAR WHAT THE CONTENT OF THE STATEMENT OR STATEMENTS WOULD BE, AND WHAT PLACE THEY WOULD OCCUPY IN A PROCEDURES PAPER IN THE MINDS OF THE ALLIES. HE THEN ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE THIRD VARIANT DESCRIBED BY THE US REP, I. E., A CATEGORY OF 19, A CATEGORY OF 11, AND A FORMULA FOR ENLARGING THIS CATEGORY. WHAT SHOULD BE THE CONTENT OF SUCH A FORMULA IN CONCRETE TERMS, HE ASKED.

16. US REP REPLIED THAT IT WAS THE EASTERN SIDE WHICH HAD RAISED THE IDEA OF ENLARGEMENT, AND THAT THE ALLIED REPS DID NOT HAVE SPECIFIC LANGUAGE IN HAND BUT RATHER VIEWED THE IDEA AS A POSSIBLE STRUCTURAL ELEMENT. THE HUNGARIAN REP ASKED IF THE GENERAL IDEA OF ENLARGEMENT WAS ACCEPTABLE FOR THE ALLIES. THE US REP REPLIED THAT IT WAS, PROVIDING ALL THE OTHER ELEMENTS SPELLED OUT IN THE THIRD ALLIED VARIANT WERE ALSO INCLUDED.

CONFIDENTIAL

*** Current Handling Restrictions *** n/a

*** Current Classification *** LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts:
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 28 MAR 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973BRUSSE01710
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: n/a
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: BRUSSELS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730339/aaaaiiyc.tel
Line Count: 169
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags: ANOMALY
Review Date: 15 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: WITHDRAWN <02-Aug-2001 by maustmc, RDFRD>; RELEASED <15-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <16-Aug-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> jms 980102
Subject: CCMS: OTTAWA PLENARY APRIL 10-11, 1973
TAGS: SENV, NATO
To: ANKARA
ATHENS
BONN
COPENHAGEN
DEPARTMENT OF TRANS PORT AU PRINCE
EUR
LISBON

LONDON
SECSTATE WASHDC

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005